

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/082,728	02/26/2002	John Erik Hershey	RD27856	4694	
6147	7590 01/20/2006		EXAMINER		
GENERAL	ELECTRIC COMPA	GHULAMALI, QUTBUDDIN			
GLOBAL RI		1.4450	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
PATENT DOCKET RM. BLDG. K1-4A59 NISKAYUNA. NY 12309				THE ENTROLLED A	
MISKATON	A, NI 12309		2637		

DATE MAILED: 01/20/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/082,728	HERSHEY ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	,
Qutub Ghulamali	2637	• ******

		Quitab Orialaman	200.	•
The	e MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY F	ILED <u>06 January 2006</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FO	R ALLOWANCE.	
this appli places th	was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or ication, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Nost for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliant ods:	wing replies: (1) an amendment, at otice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in	fidavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)
	period for reply expiresmonths from the mailin	g date of the final rejection.		
b) 🛭 The p no ev	period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A rent, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I niner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forthater than SIX MONTHS from the mailin	ng date of the final rejecti	on.
	MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7		ET MOT NET ET WAT	ILLO WITTING
have been filed i under 37 CFR 1. set forth in (b) at may reduce any	ne may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date is the date for purposes of determining the period of exportance of the specific process of the expiration date of the spoore, if checked. Any reply received by the Office late earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b)	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply oric r than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropri ginally set in the final Offi	iate extension fee ce action; or (2) as
NOTICE OF A	ce of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp	diango with 27 CER 41 27 must be	filed within two month	se of the date of
filing the	Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	o avoid dismissal of th	
	⊆ posed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,	but prior to the date of filing a brief	f will not be entered by	ecance
(a) 🔲 Th	ey raise new issues that would require further co ey raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo	nsideration and/or search (see NC		ccause
(c) 🔲 Th	ey are not deemed to place the application in be peal; and/or	•	educing or simplifying	the issues for
	ey present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally re	jected claims.	
	OTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).			
	endments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		ompliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).
	nt's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)			,
6. Newly p	roposed or amended claim(s) would be all vable claim(s).		timely filed amendme	nt canceling the
7. 🛭 For purpo how the r	oses of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) new or amended claims would be rejected is prous of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		ill be entered and an e	explanation of
	objected to:			
	rejected: 1-21 and 25.			
	withdrawn from consideration:			
	R OTHER EVIDENCE			t li a santa sant
because	avit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu applicant failed to provide a showing of good an earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).			
entered b	avit or other evidence filed after the date of filing because the affidavit or other evidence failed to c a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fai	ls to provide a
	davit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio R RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after e	entry is below or attach	ned.
11. 🛛 The req	uest for reconsideration has been considered buntinuation Sheet.	it does NOT place the application i	n condition for allowar	nce because:
12. Note the	e attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper I	No(s)	
13. 🔲 Other: _				
			JEAN B. C	MELUS

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 7-05)

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: it is alleged that the claim rejection under 35 U.S.C 102(e) to Richards et al does not disclose the limitations "producing ultrawideband downconverted pulses from the transmitted reference ultra wideband communications signals and further "receiving the transmitted reference ultra wideband communications signals using an antenna", as recited in independent claims 1, 14 and 25.

As stated in the final office action on 11/07/2005, the art to Richards discloses every feature of the claimed invention including "producing ultra wideband downconverted pulses from the transmitted reference ultra wideband communications signals and further "receiving the transmitted reference ultra wideband communications signals using an antenna". Richards very clearly discloses these limitations and the applicant is respectfully directed to Richards, page 12, section 0254, disclosing that the ultra wideband pulses are sent to a transmit antenna (624) via transmission line (626) wherein the pulses are converted (produced) into ultra wideband. At the receiver these pulses are down converted (via cross correlator and delay, see page 12, section 0257, 0258 and 0259 disclosing substantially similar features as the applicant's discussion in paragraph 0017 of his specification which in essence is considered a down conversion step). As to applicant's remarks regarding TR-UWB signal consists of two pulses, the examiner finds no such limitations claimed in the claims and therefore disagrees because no comparison of monopulses with the two pulses as the applicant eludes to in page 6 of his remarks can be found. Therefore, based on disclosure by Richards, the examiner considers the rejection of claims 1, 14 and 25 as appropriate and proper.